

**Quality Improvement/Quality Assurance Characteristics  
Selected State Child Welfare Examples  
As of January 7, 2005**

**Handout #3**

<b>Alabama</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State supervised, county administered</li> <li>• County involvement—QA Committee, QA Coordinator, stakeholders, case reviews, quantitative data analysis</li> <li>• State and county teams conduct qualitative reviews</li> <li>• State provides quantitative reports on key indicators</li> <li>• QA protocol and training for reviewers</li> <li>• QA staff: state, regional, county</li> <li>• PIP measurement: data and county review results</li> </ul>
<b>Arizona</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State administered</li> <li>• Peer review instrument modeled on the CFSR, with additional instructions and clarifications</li> <li>• Case file reviews, with some interviews</li> <li>• Focus on consistency across peer reviewers</li> <li>• QA staff: two people at state level responsible for managing process, analyzing data, and creating PIP reports</li> <li>• PIP measurement: peer review results</li> </ul>
<b>Colorado</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State supervised, county administered</li> <li>• County involvement: few counties have dedicated QA staff or function</li> <li>• QA staff: Administrative Review Division (ARD) serves state QA function; Child Welfare also has data staff</li> <li>• PIP measurement: Monthly reports crosswalk ARD data and state data with CFSR items and break down by county</li> </ul>
<b>Kentucky</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State administered</li> <li>• CQI process includes regular peer case file reviews and multilevel case reviews to ensure consistency (e.g., local, regional, state)</li> <li>• Case file review checklist with 84 questions</li> <li>• CFSR review process in each Region twice a year, for total of 32 cases</li> <li>• QA staff: Regional CQI Specialists</li> <li>• PIP Measurement: peer review results, CFSR results, data reports</li> </ul>

<b>Illinois</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State administered</li> <li>• CQI process results in peer reviews of 10% of total cases each year</li> <li>• Peer reviews occur quarterly in all 74 field offices</li> <li>• State also conducts CFSR style reviews in regions</li> <li>• QA staff: IL has a Division of Quality Assurance with 9 regional quality specialists and 10 data analysts; a field review unit has 9 staff and 4 program analysts</li> <li>• Local QI teams meet at least quarterly</li> <li>• IL also has many data reports that focus on child and family outcomes trends broken down by region</li> </ul>
<b>Minnesota</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State supervised, county administered</li> <li>• State CFSR process includes county self-assessment, review team members from other counties and stakeholder groups</li> <li>• Counties create PIPs in response to review results</li> <li>• QA staff: 5 state level staff who coordinate and lead county reviews and write final reports</li> <li>• Focus on distributing lessons learned to all counties</li> <li>• All review team members trained on review process</li> <li>• PIP measurement: data from county reviews, quantitative data</li> </ul>
<b>North Carolina</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State supervised, county administered</li> <li>• CFSR reviews in 10 counties per quarter, and Mecklenburg County every quarter</li> <li>• Stakeholder input gathered through surveys</li> <li>• Counties develop self-assessment to explain data, practice and outcomes</li> <li>• QA staff: 7 state QA staff and 10 field staff who cover multiple counties; each review includes QA and field staff</li> <li>• PIP measurement: quarterly CFSR results, data</li> </ul>
<b>New York</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State supervised, county administered</li> <li>• State produces county data packages that include point in time and cohort data for safety and permanency issues</li> <li>• Data packages also include county targets for improving child outcomes</li> </ul>
<b>Nebraska</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State administered</li> <li>• NE plans to develop CFSR process in coming year</li> <li>• QA staff: one Director and 8 staff located in local areas</li> </ul>

Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State administered</li> <li>• CQI process includes Supervisory CFSR case reviews</li> <li>• State conducts annual CFSR in every county</li> <li>• Each county develops PIP focused on three priorities</li> <li>• State develops web-based reports with detailed information on state, county, supervisory unit and worker performance on key outcomes</li> <li>• QA staff: CQI unit includes 7 staff focused on CFSRs</li> <li>• PIP measurement: case review and county CFSR results, data reports</li> </ul>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State administered</li> <li>• Case analysts conduct structured case readings and interview case participants using guide modeled on CFSR</li> <li>• State also conducts CFSR process in its 11 Regions</li> <li>• Regions receive periodic data reports on key indicators</li> <li>• Regions create PIPs based on CFSR results</li> <li>• QA staff: 22 Case Analysts, 6 Program Improvement Specialists, Central Office staff</li> <li>• PIP measurement: CFSR results, case reads, data reports</li> </ul>
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State administered</li> <li>• Annual Case Practice Reviews (CPR) of 500 reports, 125 in-home and 125 out-of-home cases; workers interviewed</li> <li>• Annual Quality Case Reviews (QCR) on 24 cases in each of four regions and 72 cases in Salt Lake region</li> <li>• QCR reviewer teams include state staff, paid consultants, and community representatives</li> <li>• Quarterly data reports on 16 key indicators</li> <li>• Trend Analysis Committee reviews data quarterly and suggests program and practice improvements</li> <li>• PIP measurement: CPR, QCR and data indicator reports</li> </ul>
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State administered</li> <li>• VT CFSR style reviews in 6 of 12 Districts each year</li> <li>• Reviewers include central and district staff and community stakeholders, all of whom are trained in review process</li> <li>• Districts develop a self-assessment prior to review</li> <li>• Districts create PIPs in response to review findings</li> <li>• VT produces data reports on national standards and uses pivot tables so Districts can drill down to worker level</li> <li>• QA staff: QA Coordinator manages the process; Quality Assurance Advisory Committee meets periodically</li> <li>• PIP measurement: data reports, PIP process updates</li> </ul>

